



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washing D.C. 2021

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT			ATTORNEY DOCK	
06/558,551	12/05/93	MOORE K		K	14201	
WILLIAM M. SMITH			EXAMINER			
DNAX RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY: INC.:			SCHAINFIL			
	O PAGE HILL RD.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUME	ER
PALO ALTO, C	A 94304			153	14	
				DATE MAILED:	13716783	

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on $\frac{9/23}{8}$	This action is made final.						
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s),	From the date of this letter. .S.C. 133						
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:  L Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.  3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449  4. Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152  5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474  6.							
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION  1. [] Claims C' - 2 5	are pending in the application,						
Of the above, claims	are withdrawn from consideration,						
2. Claims	have been cancelled.						
3. Claims	are allowed.						
4. $\sqrt{\text{ctaims}}$ $\frac{20-35}{}$	are rejected.						
5. [ Ctaims	are objected to.						
6. [] Claims are subjections	ect to restriction or election requirement,						
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject							
matter is indicated.  8. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.							
9. [ ] The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on These	drawings are [ ; acceptable;						
10. [ ] The [ ] proposed drawing correction and/or the [ ] proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been [ ] approved by the examiner, [ ] disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).							
11. [ ] The proposed drawing correction, filed							
12. [7] Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has	been receivednot been received						
been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on;							
13. The Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.							

14. 🔲 Other

Serial No. 558551

Art Unit 153

15.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

16.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

18.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Serial No. 558551 Art Unit 153

19.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Sharon et al, Rosemblatt et al or Pawlowski et al for the reasons of record.

No patentable distinction has been pointed out between the claims and the cited art.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zakut et al, Seidman et al or Early et al (cell) in view of Amster et al and further in view of instant page 40 or Ptashne for the reasons of record.

It is not apparent from the record that constant region polypeptides are necessarily produced by the cited art.

22.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C.

112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an enabling disclosure for the reasons of record.

Serial No. 558551 Art Unit 153

23.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the above objection to the specification.

24.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

25.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the invention as disclosed is inoperative and lacks utility as explained at pages 2-3 of paper #5.

Applicants' response is not addressed to the specific points made in pages 2-3 of paper #5.

26.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Ehrlich et al for the reasons of record.

Ehrlich's filing date is 9-30-80 and is thus prior art under 35 USC 102(e). Cols. 1-2 of Auditore describe prior art under 35 USC 102(b). There is nothing about glycosylation in claims 20-25.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full,

Serial No. 558551 Art Unit 153

clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide support for the claimed invention.

This is a "new matter" objection. Where is the descriptive support for the amendment to claim 20? 28.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the above objection to the specification.

H. SCHAIN: ndb

(703) 557-6525

12-06-85

HOWARD E. SCHAIN
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 150 - ART UNIT 153

Strand E. Schan